

# Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1864.

## Weekly National Intelligencer.

By GALE & SEATON.  
JAMES G. WELLING, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.  
The subscription price of this paper for a year is Two Dollars, payable in advance.

A reduction of 50 percent (one-fifth of the full charge) will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 25 percent (one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who will order and pay for, at one time, twenty or more copies.

On account of being paid for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1864.

## BACK-DOOR NEGOTIATIONS FOR PEACE.

The Republican orators and journalists of the current time make constant reference to the testimony of Mr. J. R. Gilmore, the historian of the late "peace mission" to Richmond. While constantly citing his authority for the purpose of establishing the fact that the insurgent leaders will agree to no peace which does not recognize "Southern independence"—a fact which needs no substantiation, as nobody expects any less of the "insurgent leaders"—they studiously keep in the background some very suggestive lessons taught by the narrative of Mr. Gilmore in his work entitled "Down in Tennessee," of which the pages contributed to the Atlantic Monthly purporting to be an account of the "interview" with Gen. Jefferson Davis composed but a single chapter.

As certain Republican prints and speakers, in the present mood of the party, profess a great horror at even the slightest mention of the word "peace"—a word perpetually on their lips a few weeks ago—we deem it proper to show, on the testimony of Mr. J. R. Gilmore, (and, as he is their own witness, they cannot discredit him,) that President Lincoln has already undertaken to do all that the "Woods and the Vallandighams" most denigrate in regard to opening negotiations with the Southern leaders, though under auspices quite different. We shall establish this proposition by a few citations from the work of Mr. Gilmore already designated.

It appears from this work that on the 19th of May, 1863, Col. Jaquess, commanding the Seventy-third regiment Illinois Infantry in the camp of Gen. Rosecrans at Murfreesboro', in Tennessee, wrote to that General, that he had, as he thought, reason to believe that there was a public sentiment in the South favorable to a restoration of the Union. After mentioning some facts which inspired him with this belief, he added:

"My attention has been called to these facts, and to others of a like character frequently of late, and from these considerations—though not these only, but because God has laid the duty upon me—I would submit to the proper authorities the following proposition, viz: To go into the Southern Confederacy, and return within ninety days, with reports of peace that will be acceptable to our Government."

"I shall propose no compromise with traitors, but their immediate return to their allegiance to God and their country. It is not a part of my business to discuss the probability or the possibility of any compromise with the work of the traitors, but to do it in the name of the Lord and to the results with Him. If He puts it into the hearts of my superiors to allow me to go, I shall be thankful; if not, I have discharged my duty."

On the 21st of May, 1863, Gen. Rosecrans referred the request of Col. Jaquess to the consideration of President Lincoln. He wrote as follows: "HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE CUMBERLAND, Murfreesboro', (Tenn.) May 21, 1863."

"To His Excellency the President of the United States: The Rev. Dr. Jaquess, Colonel commanding the Seventy-third Illinois, has submitted to me a proposition, and after maturely weighing his plan, and considering well his character, I am decidedly of the opinion that the public interest will be promoted by permitting him to go as he proposes."

"I do not anticipate the results that he seems to expect, but believe that a moral force will be generated by his mission that will more than compensate us for his temporary absence from his regiment."

"His letter is herein enclosed, and the bearer of this, Mr. —, can fully explain Col. Jaquess' plan and purposes."

Very respectfully,  
W. S. ROSECRANS, Major General.

The bearer of this letter to the President, whose name is left in blank, was Mr. Gilmore, as appears from the narrative which he proceeds to recite. On being admitted to an interview with Mr. Lincoln he gives the following report of the conversation that ensued:

"For my leave kept you waiting. Come in. Do you know I can't talk with you about this Jaquess matter?"

"Why not, sir?" I asked, looking him into the room.

"Because I happen to be the President of the United States. I can make no overtures to the rebels. If they want peace, all they have to do is to lay down their arms."

It will thus be seen that the President had no knowledge and no "realizing sense" of what was implied in this proposed mission of Col. Jaquess. It was a proposal to open negotiations with the "rebels" through the back-door of a self-constituted and irresponsible mission. He could not even "talk about it." He happened to be "President of the United States" and could make no overture to the rebels. Just as little could he, with consistency or propriety, in this view of his duty, allow overtures to be made by an officer of the army, who, if he proceeded on this mission at all, could go to the South only by the President's consent and authority. Now, let the reader mark the end which followed this beginning.

On the day after his first interview with Mr. Lincoln, in which the Jaquess project received such a direct rebuff, Mr. Gilmore was favored with another audience. His report of it is as follows, so far as relates to the matter in hand:

A portion of these terms have been included in the "amnesty proclamation" of last December. "The rebel" Mr. Gilmore "does not feel at liberty to make public." Have then, we have in Mr. Gilmore a candid and a President's views and purposes in regard to the terms on which peace is to be had. The fact is important for the bearing it has on the proceedings and declarations of this gentleman in the Embassy which he subsequently undertook at Richmond with the consent of the President, and in company with Col. Jaquess.

On the morning after the interview thus related Mr. Gilmore wrote to Gen. Rosecrans, communicating the result of the application made to the President in behalf of Col. Jaquess and his volunteer mission to the South. Permission was given to the Colonel to go on the mission. He was to know as much about the terms which Mr. Lincoln "would give to the rebels" as Gen. Rosecrans might think best, but he was not to say that he had those terms from the President. Ten days later, and the Colonel started on his diplomatic expedition. At Baltimore he reported to Gen. Schenck, who forwarded him to Fort Monroe. Arriving there he explained his business to Gen. Dix, who, (we copy the language of Mr. Gilmore,) "after much delay, allowed him to smuggle himself on board a flag-of-truce boat going to the rebel lines. He was in his uniform, but the rebel officer who met our flag said to him: 'Go where you please, and stay as long as you like.'"

Behold, then, Col. Jaquess inside the "rebel lines." How come he there? By permission of President Lincoln. What was his errand? To sound the sentiments of the Southern people and to open the way for negotiations that should conduct to peace? Did the President know that this was the object of his mission? It was distinctly brought to his notice by Gen. Rosecrans and unfolded by Mr. Gilmore. Was the mission a proper one by the President? So improper that when it was first suggested to him he said he "could not even talk about it." What then induced the President to reconsider his original impressions on the subject? This is a question which it concerns the President and his friends to answer, as they alone have the means of answering it, and as it is one which puts the President on his defense, not only before the country but against his own admission when this subject was first broached.

It is obvious that no legitimate defense of the propriety of the mission, if it was wrong in itself, can be found in the fact that Col. Jaquess, in being allowed to proceed on his mission, was forbidden to say that he had from the President the terms which were imparted to him. In point of fact he could offer no terms, so far as he should offer any in truth, which did not come from the President, and the concealment on this score merely adds the guilt of duplicity to a transaction which, in itself considered, the President seems to have thought utterly inadmissible until his scruples were overcome by some considerations unknown because unavowed.

Arrived within the enemy's lines, as an emissary of peace, who had gone on his mission with Mr. Lincoln's permission, but without credentials to authenticate his character, Col. Jaquess went to Petersburg, in Virginia, and there remained several weeks, holding conferences, if Mr. Gilmore may be believed, with the people and the rebel leaders on the subject of peace. From all, says Mr. Gilmore, he had the same answer:

"We are tired of the war. We are willing to give up slavery. We know it is just; but so long as our Government holds out, we must stand by it. We cannot betray it and each other."

We allow Mr. Gilmore to state in his own words the subsequent stages of this roving diplomacy in search of peace:

"Col. Jaquess remained at Petersburg several weeks, and then returned to Baltimore. From there he wrote to the President, but received no answer. He waited there a long time; but, as no answer came, finally returned to the rebel lines. Then he wrote me, stating the result of his visit, and saying he wanted to go again with liberty, as Joe Davis. [Other leaders he had seen, Davis he had not seen.] This letter came just as I was setting out on a long journey; and, naturally concluding that if he had not, answered Jaquess he would not answer me, I did not write to the President. Thus the affair rested till I returned on my journey. Then I went to Washington, and, calling on Mr. Lincoln, asked him why he had not answered Jaquess."

"I never received his letter," was the unexpected reply.

"Well, it is not too late. These people are ripe for peace now. I know that from many of them. Let Jaquess go again. There is no telling what he may accomplish. The President has written about on his chair, and on a small oval wrote the following: 'A. LINCOLN.'"

Here, then, we have another manifesto addressed "To whom it may concern," after the manner of the despatch sent by Mr. Greeley and the Southern "negotiators" at Niagara. And as in the one case so in the other—peace is the subject and object of this open letter. It was given in answer to an application based on the assurance that the Southern people were ripe for peace; "that if Jaquess could only be allowed to go again, there was no telling what he might accomplish." So the President allowed him to go again and to take Mr. Gilmore with him. If any Democrats, if any Conservatives, had manifested such a "yearning" for peace, what an outcry would have been raised from "loyal Republicans!"

Mr. Gilmore was properly the chief of the second mission, undertaken in the month of July last. It had been permitted at his instance. He was, moreover, the confidant of the purposes and views of the President on the subject of peace—views imparted to him in the year 1863. Accordingly, he received from the President the following plan:

"Allow J. R. Gilmore and I to go, with ordinary baggage, to Gen. Grant at his headquarters."

The following was also addressed by the President to Gen. Grant, that he might speed the diplomats on their way:

"Will Gen. Grant allow J. R. Gilmore and I to pass our lines, with ordinary baggage, to Gen. Grant?"

Gen. Grant, as is known, forwarded the views of Messrs. Gilmore and Jaquess by opening with the insurgent military authorities a correspondence which led to the fulfillment of their wishes. They entered the lines of the enemy. They were there by the express permission of the President of the United States, with full knowledge on his part that they went with terms and propositions of peace. Arrived in Richmond, Messrs. Gilmore and Jaquess addressed the following note to Mr. Benjamin, the Confederate Secretary of State:

"SPOTSWOOD HOUSE, Richmond, (Va.) July 17, 1864.  
"Hon. J. B. BENJAMIN, Secretary of State, &c.  
Dear Sir: The undersigned respectfully solicit an interview with President Davis.  
"They visit Richmond only as private citizens, and have no official character or authority; but they are acquainted with the views of the United States Government and with the sentiments of the Northern people relative to an adjustment of the differences existing between the North and the South, and earnestly hope that a free interchange of views between President Davis and themselves may open the way to such official negotiations as will result in restoring PEACE to the now distracted country."  
"They, therefore, ask an interview with the President, and, awaiting your reply, are,  
"Truly and respectfully yours,  
"JAMES R. GILMORE, of Illinois,  
"JAMES M. JAQUESS, of Massachusetts."

The reader has already been informed of the circumstances and opportunities which enabled Mr. Gilmore and Col. Jaquess to say that they were "acquainted" with the views of the United States Government on the subject of the terms and conditions of peace. We may, therefore, look to the proposition they made as being one which they knew to be in accordance with the "views" of President Lincoln. What was that proposition? We quote from Mr. Gilmore's report of his interview with "President Davis"—an interview which had been granted him only on the assurance given that he and Col. Jaquess "were acquainted with the views of the United States Government." The proposition was as follows:

"Suppose the two Governments should agree to something like this: To go to the people with two propositions: 1st, peace, with Union and Southern independence, as your proposition; and 2nd, peace, with Union, emancipation, no confederation, and universal amnesty, as ours. Let the citizens of all the United States (as they exist before the war) vote 'yes' or 'no' on these two propositions, at a special election within sixty days. If a majority vote 'yes,' our Government to be bound by it, and to let you go in peace. If a majority vote 'no,' you to be bound by it, and to let us go in peace. The two Governments can contract in this way, and the people, through their representatives, shall be able to decide on peace or war, on an elect which of the two propositions shall govern their rulers. Let Lee and Grant, meanwhile, agree to an armistice. This would shut the mouths of all who sneered, it would never again be drawn by this generation."

Here, then, we have the "views" of President Lincoln respecting the terms of peace, if Mr. Gilmore is to be credited as a man of veracity, which nobody disputes, and, least of all, any body in the Republican party, of which he is an active and zealous member. Here, too, we have the original of the "armistice"—embraced as part and parcel of the President's views. Here, too, alas! we have the terms of a proposition which embraces disunion as an alternative—the question of Union or no Union being remitted to the chance, not of fear, but of the pacific ballot.

All these, be it observed, are the President's views, unless Mr. Gilmore was a guilty prevaricator to Gen. Jefferson Davis, and unless he has convicted himself of untruth before the American people. We know very well that Mr. Gilmore, in his report of the interview he had with "President Davis," is particular to disclaim the presumption of "having in any way acted for Mr. Lincoln," and he adds that "neither Col. Jaquess nor himself had any official or unofficial authority from the President; that they were not requested or authorized to express his views, opinions, or desires to Mr. Davis or to any one else." This may all be very true—the reader will not fail to mark the measured terms in which the disclaimer is couched—and yet, unless what they said to General Jefferson Davis did fairly and fully reflect the "views" of Mr. Lincoln, they played equally false to both "Presidents." For Mr. Lincoln allowed them to "go South" in the full assurance that, though acting on their own responsibility, they would not misrepresent his "views," and thus frustrate the object of their mission. To "President Davis" they gave the full assurance that, though not acting in any official or authorized capacity, they were none the less "acquainted with the views of the United States Government," and, unless the proposition which they made was in conformity with those "views," they are convicted of a deliberate and wanton, because a most gratuitous falsification, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Gilmore had, in the way he discloses, been put in confidential possession of the opinions and purposes of the President on this subject.

Now, let these terms and conditions, with the proposition of an "armistice," and the alternative of disunion included, be compared with the following "reasonable resolutions" of the Chicago Convention:

"Resolved, That in the future, as in the past, we will adhere with unswerving fidelity to the Union, under the Constitution, as the only solid foundation of our country, and happiness as a people, and as a frame-work of government equally conducive to the welfare and prosperity of all the States, both Northern and Southern."

"Resolved, That the Convention do hereby declare, as the sense of the American people, that the only way to restore the Union by the experiment of war—during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or a power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired—justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to an ultimate Convention of the States, who, after peaceable means, may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States."

If the reader has made the comparison suggested, we have nothing more to say. What more need be said to point the political hypocrisy which disclaims against the Chicago Convention, but has nothing to say against the Gilmore-Jaquess mission?

The prize steamer *Vance*, which captured the late rebel steamer *Jefferson*, has been reported, arrived at New York yesterday.

## TERMS OF PEACE.

An esteemed correspondent sends us a very able and interesting communication, inspired we know by a love of country as pure as it is fervent, in which he suggests a plan for the pacification of the troubles which are now afflicting our unhappy land. Unable to find room for the elaborate argument by which the writer supports his proposition, we give the proposition itself for the purpose of making a few suggestions upon it. It is as follows:

"The plan or platform of peace which only will meet the justice of the case, and deliver the nation from the tolls in which it is entangled by the madness of those who, on either side, have been seeking their own personal aggrandizement at the expense of the whole people, is simply this: Reconstruction of the Union, with the abandonment of secession and slavery by the Southern States; and the compensation of slaveholders for all the property lost by them, or lost by them, in any manner during the war. The recognition of the entire debt of both sides incurred during the war, and the creation of a funded debt of the Government of the United States, with the addition of that to the now existing debt, for the purpose of paying the debt of the reconstructed Government of the United States."

"The aggregate of this 'consolidated debt' would be enormous, so great that figures would fail to express it to the understanding of those who are not conversant with the distance between colossal bodies of the same order of magnitude, or convey a definite impression. Still the amount is finite and trifling, when compared with that which is being heaped up by the devastating and destructive progress of absolute and after ruin, unless shut short by the assumption of some fixed point at which to stop."

Cordially sympathizing with all who have it in their hearts to promote the things that make for peace on the basis of truth and justice, we are constrained to believe that the proposition of our correspondent has nothing on which it can rest except the sincerity of the motives by which it is prompted. His proposition would be equally unacceptable to all parties on both sides of the dividing line between the contending sections.

On the North side of this line the dominant party in the Government believes in its ability to carry on the war until its logical results shall be reached in the "abnegation" and, if need be, in the "extermination" of the Southern people. They are, therefore, in no mood for entertaining propositions which look to a peaceful solution of our troubles. And just as little would the opponents of the Administration agree to assume for themselves and their posterity the cost of the emancipation of the slaves of the South, in addition to the debt incurred by both parties to a war in which our own debt alone is rapidly becoming a portentous burden. This disposition of both parties was sufficiently proved by the cold reception which the message of President Lincoln in favor of emancipation with compensation received at the hands of Republicans and Democrats in the last Congress. Nothing was done to efface the President's policy under this head except to pass a barren resolution, which made the failure to furnish a practical measure in conformity with it only the more conspicuous.

And we see no reason to suppose that there is any party at the South which could be induced to accept Union and peace on the terms proposed, if there was any party at the North ready to offer them. The leaders of the insurgent Government still believe, or profess to believe, in their capacity to conduct the struggle in which they are engaged to a successful conclusion. They are fighting to exert an acknowledgment of "Southern independence," not to procure compensation for their slaves, or to induce a willingness on the part of the United States to assume the debt incurred on both sides in the war.

As our correspondent does us the honor to allude in terms of commendation to the article which appeared in our editorial columns on the 27th ultimo, under the title of "Whence and Whither," and as this article, it seems, suggested to his mind the preparation of the communication with which he has favored us, we may presume to say again, as we said in that article, that we see as yet in the signs of the times little that induces us to hope for a speedy settlement of the dissensions which shake the land. We believe that the war, as now conducted by both parties, has no issue which will conduct either of them to all the ends for which either is striving. But neither party has yet come to apprehend the impossibilities of its situation, and hence neither party is to-day in any mood which induces it to acknowledge the "logic of events." Instead of this, the promptings of pride and passion, re-enforced in many cases by a sincere, but, as we conceive, a misguided patriotism, encourage the dominant party at the North to persist in a style of war which, if regard be had to its processes or its avowed ends, threatens, in our eyes, to render a speedy peace impossible, and ultimate disunion inevitable. The dominant party at the South is equally set in its purpose to exert from the Government of the United States a reluctant recognition of the right of secession, with such territorial possessions as a recognition of this right may be construed to carry with it. Until there is a great lowering of such pretensions there will be no hope of peace. We do not believe that all the logical results of the war in the direction that has been impressed upon it by the violence of either party will be reached by either of the parties to it. When the "logic of events" shall have fully impressed the lessons of Divine Providence on the hearts of the people in both sections, and clearly shown them the impossibility of some of the ends for which they are severally contending, we may hope to see them both turn their thoughts to those things which make for peace on the basis of "possibilities." What those possibilities shall be no man can say to-day, because as yet the conditions of knowledge on this score do not exist, and they cannot exist as long as the minds of men in both sections are pre-occupied with conflicting "impossibilities," upon the attainment of which they have equally set their hearts and fixed their wills.

The Boston Traveller announces that a new and formidable naval expedition is now in preparation, of which Admiral Porter is to have command.

## THE DRAFT.

Our readers will remember that the New York Evening Post expressed the opinion several months ago that some one of the express companies of that city could end the war more expeditiously and economically than the War Department of the present Administration is likely to do. At a later day, only a few weeks ago, it suggested that any call for additional troops had better come from Generals Grant and Sherman than from the President of the United States. It said that the President's proclamation for half a million had "chilled the blood of the people. It breathed delay, it hinted another year of war; but a word from Grant or Sherman, a message to the people from the armies, telling them how near is the end of the great struggle if only the country will help vigorously, would produce an immediate response."

Our contemporary, therefore, concluded as follows:

"If, then, Gen. Sherman needs help, let him call upon the country for it; if Gen. Grant requires more men, let him speak in the name of the gallant old army of the Potomac, and call with authority upon the volunteers of the nation, and send gladly to the field many thousands whom the thought of a draft chills with hint of an interminable and hopeless struggle."

In commenting on these suggestions at the time of their utterance, we ventured to observe that we could not concur with the Post in its recommendation that the President should abrogate his legitimate functions as the constitutional commander of the army so far as to authorize Generals Grant and Sherman to call for the troops they may want.

It seems that we were more jealous of the President's prerogatives in this matter than the Secretary of War. For Mr. Stanton has so far adopted the suggestions of the Evening Post as to give publicity to the views of Gen. Grant and Sherman with regard to the wants of the military service. And as the despatches of these commanders are respectively dated at "City Point, (Va.) 10.30 A. M. September 13, 1864," and "Atlanta, (Geo.) 6.30 P. M. September 13, 1864," it is no very violent presumption that they were both elicited by a request from the Secretary that they should favor him with "views" which would be likely to reinforce the President's proclamation, and make the draft slightly more palatable. We find this entirely proper, though, for the sake of popular effect, we could wish that the appearance of concert and pre-arrangement in the matter might have been avoided, if indeed, as we would prefer to believe, these "views" of Gen. Grant and Sherman were spontaneously tendered. As they now stand, without explanation of their origin, the similarity of their dates and tenor produces on the mind the impression of what the late Mr. Pickwick would call a "very extraordinary coincidence." But, in any event, we shall have an opportunity of seeing whether a call from Grant and Sherman will, according to the prediction of the Evening Post, produce such a quick response as shall render a draft unnecessary.

## DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION OF NEW YORK.

The Democratic State Convention of New York assembled at Albany on Wednesday last, and, after temporarily organizing, adjourned to Thursday. Hon. Marshall B. Champlin was the temporary chairman, and the Hon. Daniel Pratt the permanent President.

Five sets of delegates appeared and claimed seats from New York: "The Tammany," "The Mozart Hall," "The New (Coxsack) Mozart Hall," and "The Democratic Central." The decision of their respective claims delayed the business of the Convention. The report was most favorable to the Tammany delegates, and the rest withdrew.

The Hon. Horatio Seymour was nominated for reelection as Governor. He had declined a reelection, but it is hoped he will accept. David R. Floyd Jones was nominated for Lieutenant Governor, James Lord for Canal Commissioner, and David B. McNeil for Inspector of the State Prison.

Gen. McClellan's letter was read during the sitting of the Convention, and was received with great enthusiasm. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New York, through their representatives in convention assembled, ratify and endorse the nomination of Gen. George B. McClellan for President and George H. Pendleton for Vice President of the United States, and that we pledge to them the electoral vote of the Empire State."

"Resolved, That the patriotic principles declared by the National Democratic Convention, as nobly and eloquently expounded by its candidate for the Presidency, in his recent letter of acceptance, embody a line of public policy upon which alone the American people can restore the Union, re-establish constitutional liberty, give security to individual rights, and secure the return of a permanent and honorable peace."

"Resolved, That we heartily respond to the pledge of our candidate, George B. McClellan, that he will, if elected, 'exhaust all the resources of statesmanship to secure peace, to re-establish the Union, and guarantee for the future the rights of every State; that with this pledge and the Jacksonian declaration that the Union must be maintained at all hazards,' that 'it is the one condition of peace' that 'without it no peace can be permanent,' we present him for the suffrages of the electors of New York, without which he will not be the only candidate capable of restoring the Union under the Constitution."

"Resolved, That the Democratic party of the State of New York, as it always has been, unalterably opposed to the rebellion, and that we recognize in the victories of the national army and navy, and in the manifest popular determination to change the present Administration and return to the policy to which the Executive, Congress, and the People were solemnly pledged in the Crittenden resolution, co-operative movements toward peace and honor."

"Resolved, That the Administration of Abraham Lincoln, by its usurpations, its disregard of the Constitution, its violation of personal liberty and State rights, its resort to military power to subvert civil authority, its temporizing and cowardly degradation of the nation in its foreign policy, its perversion of the war from its original object, and its avowed determination to prolong it, in the language of Abraham Lincoln, to compel 'the abandonment of slavery,' has become revolutionary in its character; and that we will not count him as the only candidate capable of uniting in a substantial in its place as a candidate which will seek 'in the Constitution of the United States, and the laws passed in accordance therewith, the rule of its duty and the limitations of its power.'"

"Resolved, That the thanks of the people of New York are tendered to the editors and authors of this State and of the Union who have so nobly defended our flag and our nationality; that we will honor the living, liberally and generously care for the sick and wounded, and gratefully acknowledge the memory of the dead."

"Resolved, That Governor Horatio Seymour the gratitude of the Democracy is ever due. They can never forget that it was he who, in the midst of our disasters, and in the face of an overbearing adversary, was foremost in upholding the banner of constitutional liberty, which he has since borne through every battle; that it was he who by his wisdom arrested public discord, by his firmness repelled aggression upon State rights and personal liberty, and by the purity of his public life and the elevation of his purposes exhibited, in the midst of corruption and selfishness, the highest qualities of a statesman and a patriot."

## WHY THE SOUTH HOPES FOR MR. LINCOLN'S RE-ELECTION.

The National Committee of the Republican party, in their address "to the People of the United States," affirm that every "rebel organ" in the Secession States expresses a desire for the election of Gen. McClellan and the defeat of Mr. Lincoln. We yesterday showed the falsity of this representation by citing extracts from several leading journals in the South which avowed a desire for the election of Mr. Lincoln or the defeat of Gen. McClellan. We have yet seen no exception to expressions of this tenor in the secession journals since Gen. McClellan has been placed in nomination. A more elaborate exposition of Southern sentiment on this point may be found in the following article of the Richmond Enquirer, commonly supposed to be the confidential organ of Gen. Jefferson Davis, in its number of the 6th instant.

From the Richmond Enquirer of September 6th.  
The Democratic nominees in the United States are McClellan for President and Pendleton for Vice President. What concern have the people of these Confederate States in the fate of these candidates at the approaching election? In our opinion the interest and hope of peace is not greatly advanced by these nominations. From Gen. McClellan our people can have but little hope of peace, other than a reconstruction peace.

What hope do his antecedents hold out that should encourage our people to believe that he would yield our nationality any sooner than Mr. Lincoln? He is by far the more dangerous man for us; had his policy been persistently followed, and the war conducted on the principles of civilized warfare, he might have divided our people, and perhaps conquered our liberties. With consummate abilities he clearly foresees that emancipation might possibly free the negroes, but could not unite the sections; that confiscation might enrich his soldiers, but could not reconcile our people; hence, with an earnest and honest love for the Union, he avoided these fatal acts, and conducted the war for the restoration of the Union rather than the destruction of the South. His policy was the olive branch in one hand and the sword in the other, to conquer by power and conciliate by kindness. It was a most dangerous policy for us; for if the ameliorating hand of Federal kindness had softened the rigors of war, our people would not have been subjected to those terrible fires of suffering by which Mr. Lincoln has hardened every heart and steeled every sentiment against our merciless foes. As a sincere secessionist, preferring war and nationality to peace and the Union, we looked upon the fact of a difference between Mr. Lincoln and Gen. McClellan as to the proper policy of conducting the war as peculiarly fortunate for our cause. We hailed the proclamations of emancipation and confiscation, and the policy of plunder and devastation, as sure pledges of our ultimate triumph; they were terrible ordeals, but they most effectually eradicated every sentiment of Union, and, arousing the pride as well as the interest of our people, inspired the patriotism of the whole, until they would have accepted death as preferable to ultimate defeat.

Now, between McClellan and Lincoln there are many points of difference. The former is a man of talents, of information, of grandeur and great military experience and ability; the latter is a simple, plain, easy fool, a good but vulgar joker. While McClellan has the interest of the Union only at heart, Mr. Lincoln has the faintest object of freeing negroes for his inspiration. Between "my plan," as Gen. Grant has conducted it, and one by Gen. McClellan, there could not have been the success that has already attended our arms. For we last more than fighting the science of McClellan on the Peninsula than we have in repelling the furious but ill-conducted assault of Gen. Grant. Thus, whether we look at this nomination in the light of peace or of war, we prefer Lincoln to McClellan. We can make better terms of peace with an anti-slavery fanatic than with the earnest Unionist. We can gain more military success in a war conducted on "my plan" than one of a real soldier like McClellan, and sooner destroy the resources and strength of our enemy where they are managed and manipulated by the light-fingered gentry of Messrs. Chase and Freedmen than when husbanded and carefully controlled by such a man as Guthrie. Our last hope is from the honest fanatics of the United States, men who believe in their hearts that slavery is the sum of all villainies, and who really and sincerely believe it to be their duty to separate their country from this "relic of barbarism." Such men, when they find that their people are tired of the war, will end it by a peace that sacrifices territory to freedom, and will let the South "go," provided she carries slavery with her. These men believe no less that the just powers of Government are derived from the consent of the governed than that all men are created free and equal. The two postulates are of like importance to an abolitionist.

Both the abolitionist and the Democrat are our enemies—the one, because we have slaves, the other, because we are Unionists. Nor does their enmity differ in degree; they both hate us now intensely. The Chicago platform is that "peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States"—that is, reconstruction of the Union as it was, with slavery protected by the nominal laws, but warped upon by a real sentiment, aggravated and embittered by the war. The reconstructed Union of the Chicago platform would be the certain destruction—first, of slavery, and next of slaveholders. With Lincoln and the Baltimore platform, we of the Confederate States know where we are—outside of the pale of mercy, devoted to ruin and destruction, with no hope save in the justice and protection of God, and the courage and manliness of our soldiers. With secrets and markets and cannon we fight Lincoln, and this part affords no reason of apprehension of the future. But in the reconstructed Union of the Chicago platform we would be deprived of our weapons without being reconciled to our foe.

There is no question between the two men General McClellan enjoys far more of the respect of the people of these States than Lincoln, and the Democratic party far more of our confidence than the Republican, and that if reconstruction were possible it would be more probable under Gen. McClellan and the Democrats than under Lincoln and the Republicans. The Northwest inspires one and New England the other; but as long as New England imposes the dogmas of her civilization and the tenets of her fanaticism upon the mind and people of the Northwest, there may be peace and separation, but there never can be Union and harmony. If the Northwest desires the restoration of the Union, let its people shake off the bondage of New England, and show to the world that a new era of toleration and fraternal kindness has risen in the place of fanatical Partition and selfish ostracism.

## ELECTION IN LOUISIANA.

We have New Orleans papers to the 7th instant, which inform us that the election held in Louisiana on the 5th for the adoption or rejection by the people of the constitution lately framed by the Constitutional Convention, resulted in its adoption by a large majority. Members of Congress and for the State Legislature were also elected. In the parish of Orleans five thousand four hundred and sixty-three votes were polled. Four thousand six hundred and eighty-seven and eighty-nine for the rejection. The names of the pro-secession elected Congressmen are as follows: Dr. M. N. Boutwell in the first district; G. F. Fields in the second district; William D. Mann in the third district; Thomas M. Wells in the fourth district; and Mr. Tinsler in the fifth district. The True Delta says that this delegation is a credit to the State. It is stated that the total number of votes polled throughout the State was between ten and eleven thousand.